DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 820 JC 740 276

AUTHOR	Jones, Dean H.
TITLE	An Analysis of Students' Perception of Their Role in Governance at Gaston College.
INSTITUTION	Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE	25 Jun 74
NOTE	29p.; Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of requirements for Doctor of Education degree
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Administration; *Community Colleges; Governance; Post Secondary Education; Practicums; *Role Perception; *Student Attitudes; *Student Participation; Student Rights
IDENTIFIERS	*Gaston College

ABSTRACT

To determine the extent to which students felt that they should be involved in institutional governance at Gaston College, 100 students were asked to indicate on a list of 30 pertinent college activities the degree to which they felt students should be involved in the activities. The degree of involvement involved five choices, from no student involvement to completely under student direction. The students favored no student involvement in selection of college president, faculty hiring, faculty promotion, teaching loads, class size, teacher salaries, and requirements for degrees and certificates. In five areas, the students favored some student involvement: setting institutional goals, establishing attendance policies, allocation of annual college budget, allocation of student financial aid, and determining the administrative structure of the college. The 17 areas in which equal student involvement was favored were: selection of college officials directly related to student affairs, allocation of student activity fees, regulation of student conduct, recognition of student organizations, approval of guest speakers invited by students, alterations in college calendar, distribution of student-initialed literature on campus, release of student records, admissions standards for curricula, curricula or course changes, student probation and suspension policies, development of physical facilities, planning commencement exercises, college publications, grading policies, and faculty evaluation. Students wanted to largely control student publications. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 094820

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR ROLE IN GOVERNANCE AT GASTON COLLEGE

COLLEGE GOVERNANCE MODULE

by

Dean E. Jones

Gaston College

JC 740 276

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JUNE 25, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	2
3.	PROCEDURES	11
4.	RESULTS	13
	AREAS IN WHICH STUDENTS FAVORED NO STUDENT INVOLVEMENT	14
	AREAS IN WHICH STUDENTS FAVORED SOME STUDENT INVOLVEMENT	15
	AREAS IN WHICH STUDENTS FAVORED EQUAL STUDENT INVOLVEMENT	16
5.	RECOMMENDATIONS	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY		23
APPENDIX		24

INTRODUCTION

Governance is a nebulous term to the average student in the community college. Usually an explanation is needed when the term is mentioned before two-year college students. What is meant by governance? Walter Schenkel describes governance as the process of direct control by individuals and groups over the affairs of an institution.[1] Charles R. Monroe defines governance in the following manner:

> Governance is a comprehensive term to describe all aspects of the control and direction of the college, including the state constitution, statutes, state boards of control, the administration, and in some institutions, the faculty and the student body. It involves both the policy making mechanisms and the agencies through which the policies are executed or administered.[2]

A system of college governance is much more than a simple tool or instrument designed to serve the institution's goal of education. It is more accurate to visualize governance as an intricate set of powers, authorities and influence relationships embedded in a wider and more general college environment. The general college environment in which governance operates helps to mold the performance and style of the people involved. Similarly, the manner in which governance operates, the processes to which it adheres, and the way in which it treats issues and participants, will help shape the broader context surrounding it.[3]

---

[1]Walter Schenkel, "Who Has Been in Power?", Power and Authority, eds. Harold L. Hodgkinson and L. Richard Meeth (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1971), p. 2.

[2]Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1972), p. 303.

[3]Caleb Foote, Henry Mayer and Associates, The Culture of the University: Governance and Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1968), pp. 16-17.

How do students perceive their role in the governance structure and processes at Gaston College? It is the writer's desire in this practicum to attempt to answer this fundamental question. Up to this point no thorough investigation has been made at Gaston College to determine what students think with regard to participation in governance.

Students have long been victims of "benign neglect" in institutions of higher education. It may be accurately stated that neglect of students in governance has been a lingering tradition in colleges and universities throughout the country. Student participation in college affairs is usually limited to casting votes in student elections, engaging in social activities or working on student publications. The existing situation is unfair for unquestionably the most creative force in shaping the two-year college has been and will continue to be the student.

Undoubtedly, one of the causes of student apathy and unrest is the feeling of powerlessness. Students have little voice in the educational policies which so thoroughly guide and direct their lives. The time is ripe for community colleges to provide the opportunity for students to become purposefully involved in the affairs of their institutions. Perhaps this practicum will arouse interest in governance among students and open doors for more active participation.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Student involvement in college governance is a recent development. Historically, college students have been disenfranchised persons with little or no voice in the affairs of colleges. Before 1960 college administrators would have considered it absurd and outlandish to

seriously concern themselves with student rights.[4] Students have been the "forgotten people" on the college campus. The relationship of a college to its students has been that of in loco parentis, meaning that the college acts as a substitute parent. The authority most frequently cited for this doctrine is the 1913 Kentucky Supreme Court case of Gott v. Berea College in which the court stated in part:

> College authorities stand in loco parentis concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental training of the pupils, and we are unable to see why to that end they may not make any rules or regulations for the government or betterment of their pupils that a parent could for the same purpose.[5]

The philosophy of in loco parentis is much disputed today. Since 1962 there have been massive changes with regard to student rights and involvement in the educational process. Some writers have referred to the 1960's as the years of students' quest for freedoms. Today's students are asking what their rights are as members of the academic community. Moreover, students are demanding full participation in educational decisions which greatly control their daily lives. Because of their vociferous demands, contemporary students are an unusual breed when compared with students of previous generations. The age of the silent student appears to be gone forever.

Students have been outspoken in recent years perhaps for valid reasons. Robert Van Waes cites six reasons for student frustration and dissatisfaction:

> 1. They object to size and impersonality. They seek identity, moral affiliation, and a genuine sense of community.

---

[4]Monroe, op. cit., p. 238.

[5]Robert Callis, "Educational Aspects of In Loco Parentis," College Student Personnel, eds. Laurine E. Fitzgerald, Walter F. Johnson and Willa Norris (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), pp. 91-93.

2. They object to curriculum. They regard much of it as irrelevant to the solution of the anguished problems of the real world, and they wish relevance, commitment, and leverage.

3. They object to teaching methods. They reject canned knowledge, packaged formulae, learning by fiat, and the lack of genuine dialogue.

4. They object to outdated social rules. They seek escape, rather than continuation, of adolescence, and wish to be independent, developing adults, with full responsibility for their acts. If they can save themselves, then they may be equipped to save the world.

5. They object to neglect of rights and freedoms: in classroom, student government, student publications, student organizations, as citizens, and in disciplinary areas. They strive for dignity, privacy, respect and justice.

6. They object to lack of a significant role in institutional government. They believe in student power, which they define as their right to contribute according to their interest, their stake, and their competence in institutional matters that affect their lives.[6]

Even though these objections of students appear to be valid, there are those who maintain that student activism indicates a moral and psychological weakness among youth. They believe students are disquieted and restive because of a lack of discipline, meaning or values. It is believed that student unrest is a direct result of disturbed family life. The most common explanation of student activism is that it is the consequence of too much permissiveness in rearing children. Activist students, critics maintain, have been influenced by affluence, radical thinking and modern psychological views of child rearing. Proponents of this view maintain that some parents have abdicated their responsibility to teach and discipline their children. In doing so these parents have produced a generation of spoiled, greedy youth who are incapable of tolerating even the most minor frustrations without resorting to anger or puerile responses. In short, the implication permeating these criticisms of activist students

---

[6] Robert Van Waes, "Student Freedoms and Educational Reform," Stress and Campus Response, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1968), pp. 75-76.

is that something is wrong with them, and not only them, but their parents as well.[7]

Whether the preceding criticisms of activist students are warranted or unwarranted, the fact remains that students have little power on the average college campus, and in particular, the community college campus. A survey was done in 1968 by McAninch of the student government organizations in several community colleges. The survey showed how powerless most community college student governments are. Of the community colleges studied, only fifteen precent of the student government organizations had complete jurisdiction over the expenditure of student fees collected to support student activities. Twenty-five percent had no control at all over how student activity fees were spent. Students shared some power with the administration and faculty in the control of student activity fees in the remaining sixty percent of the community colleges. The survey also indicated that the two major areas of disagreement between administrators and leaders in student government were the administrative veto over student government decisions and the degree to which the administration should indoctrinate the students in the overall philosophy of the college. About half of the students favored indoctrination and the veto whereas almost all of the administrators did.[8]

Community college educators often point to student apathy as one of the reasons for lack of student participation in governance. The degree of student apathy to student government is reflected in a recent survey

---

[7]S. L. Halleck, "Twelve Hypotheses of Student Unrest," Stress and Campus Response, ed. G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1968), p. 117.

[8]Monroe, op. cit., p. 239.

conducted in eighty-five California two-year institutions. Over eighty-three percent of the institutions had fewer than forty percent of the members of the student body voting in the spring election of 1969. Over thirty-eight percent of the institutions had less than twenty percent of the student body voting in the same election.[9] With this kind of student indifference evident in California junior colleges and in Gaston College as well, it becomes most difficult for student leaders to be heard when they plea for greater participation in college affairs.

Community colleges are unique institutions with somewhat unique student bodies. Consequently, there are other deterrents to broader participation of community college students in institutional affairs. Some of the factors which hinder student participation in institutional governance are:

1. Most community college students work. It has been estimated that between fifty and seventy-five percent of two-year college students are employed either part-time or full-time. This figure holds true also for Gaston College. "Working your way through college" is a part of the American tradition. One of the advantages of the community college is that students can seek employment in the community where they live and attend college at the same time.[10] The socioeconomic background of community college students makes employment almost mandatory. It is probably unrealistic to assume that public community college students should be able to participate in college functions on the same scale as students who are unemployed.

---

[9]William L. Deegan, Karl O. Drexel, John T. Collins and Dorothy L. Kearney, "Student Participation in Governance," The Junior College Journal (November, 1970), p. 17.

[10]James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community College (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960), p. 153.

2. Community college students commute to and from school. Since most community colleges do not have dormitories, students spend much less time on campus than senior college students. Living at home and in familiar surroundings lessens the interest of students in college activities. It is customary for community college students to attend classes three or four hours each day and immediately depart for home or work.

3. Participation in governance requires too much time and effort for the benefits received. Are the rewards worth the involvement? The impact of most community college student governments on institutional decision-making is so weak that most students hesitate to become involved.[11] Undoubtedly, this is the main reason more students fail to involve themselves in college governance.

4. Community college students are inadequately informed concerning the purpose and role of the student government organization. Vague ideas and misinformation about student government are common among community college students. Thorough indoctrination during orientation sessions could help rectify this situation. More encouragement also should be given students to identify with and participate in student government activities.

5. Many community college students attend class during evening hours. Almost all of the activities of student government occur during the day. Few evening students are involved in college functions because

---

[11]Deegan, Drexel, Collins and Kearney, op. cit., p. 22.

of this. Also, evening students tend to be older than day students. In the fall quarter of 1973, evening students comprised thirty-seven percent of the Gaston College student body.

6. A large proportion of community college students enter the two-year college with the intention of transferring later to a senior college. Medsker has reported that between two-thirds and three-fourths of the beginning students in community colleges expect to transfer. This figure is also true at Gaston College. These students often hesitate to become involved in institutional affairs at the community college and seem to place more emphasis on attendance at the four-year institution.

7. Community colleges have a large number of older students. Regular day students in community colleges range from sixteen to more than seventy years.[12] Older students usually have off-campus interests which preclude their participating to a large extent in campus activities. The age breakdown of students at Gaston College during the fall quarter of 1973, was as follows: 20 years of age and below - 843 students, ages 21 to 30 - 873 students, ages 31 to 40 - 297 students, ages 41 to 50 - 123 students, ages 51 to 60 - 27 students, and ages 61 to 70 - 7 students. Older students are not as prone as younger students to participate in college functions.

Although these constraints pose a problem for student involvement in community college governance, they need not preclude student participation in governance processes provided sufficient encouragement is given by the college administration. Unfortunately, much of the time of college administrators has been spent in reaction toward student demands rather

---

[12]Thornton, op. cit., pp. 151-153.

than action, and in trying to maintain the status quo instead of concentrating on student rights and needs. The current structures in most community colleges do not provide for any effective student voice in institutional decision-making.[13]

The question naturally arises as to why community college students should participate in the governance process. There are several obvious reasons why students should be involved in institutional governance. Firstly, as has been pointed out in numerous and sundry ways, authority in an organization is dependent upon the assent of those governed. Failure to adopt policies and procedures agreed upon by the majority of the student body will force the college to use coercion in order to operate. The use of force and coercion to implement policies creates frustration and discontent. Policies should never be established without the participation of the student body. This is true because of the nature of authority.[14] Barnard defines authority as the willingness and capacity of individuals to submit to the necessities of cooperative systems."[15] It may therefore be concluded that if colleges are to achieve student acceptance of institutional policies, then they will need to involve students in the development of such policies or risk alienating them.

---

[13]Deegan, Drexel, Collins and Kearney, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[14]Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "The Student's Role in the Affairs of the College," Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, eds. Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 54.

[15]Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Clyde E. Blocker and Louis W. Bender, Governance for the Two-Year College (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 87.

Secondly, the community college has been designed to foster growth among its students. Growth cannot take place unless an atmosphere of freedom exists. Students should have the right to make mistakes, so long as such mistakes are not injurious to the individual or institution. The philosophy of individual freedom encourages the development of self-control. One of the purposes of the community college is to encourage the development of self-control within students and prepare them for responsible citizenship in an adult world.[16] Students cannot grow to maturity unless they are allowed to make decisions for themselves, particularly decisions which daily affect their lives.

Thirdly, students voluntarily affiliate with the academic community.[17] Since students are volunteers in the college community rather than draftees, they should not be forced to accept policies and directives which have been unilaterally established.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that the student is first of all a member of the total community and is entitled to the rights and responsibilities of any citizen of similar age and maturity. The academic community has neither the right nor the responsibility to establish itself as a substitute parent unless it has received a specific mandate from its constituency to that effect.[18]

Recently at Gaston College a proposed declaration of student rights was published in the school's newspaper, the Gaslight. Concerning student

---

[16] Richardson, "The Student's Role in the Affairs of the College," op. cit., pp. 54-56.

[17] Ibid., p. 54.

[18] Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms," The Junior College Journal (February, 1969), p. 35.

participation in institutional governance, the declaration stated:

> As constituents of the academic community, students should be free, individually and collectively, to express their views on issues or institutional policy and on matters of general interest to the student body. The student body should have clearly defined means to participate in the formulation and application of institutional policy affecting academic and student affairs. The role of the student government within the areas of its jurisdiction should be reviewed only through orderly and prescribed procedures.[19]

This declaration of student rights is only a foretaste of things to come with regard to student involvement in governance at Gaston College. The public community college is no longer exempt from facing the issue of student rights and freedoms. Community college educators might as well bury the idea, "it can't happen here." Students want "a piece of the action" and this study attempts to ascertain just how much of the "action" students at Gaston College feel they should have.

PROCEDURES

In conducting the study, an instrument was developed to determine the extent students believe that they should participate in governance at Gaston College. The idea for this particular instrument came from Richard C. Richardson, Jr., in a published article in the February, 1969, Junior College Journal.

The instrument consisted of a list of thirty pertinent college activities. Students were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt

---

[19] Gaston College Gaslight, May, 1974, vol. 9, No. 4, p. 2.

students should be involved in each of the activities. As to the degree of involvement, students were asked to select one of five choices: 1) no student involvement, 2) some student involvement, 3) equal student involvement, 4) largely under student direction and 5) completely under student direction.

It was the writer's initial goal to invite at least thirty students to participate in the study. After conferring with several students and faculty members, the decision was made to increase the number of student participants in the study from thirty to one-hundred in order to gain a more representative view of student opinion. Getting this many student volunteers turned out to be a lot more difficult than first anticipated due to student involvement in activities at the end of the school year. Students involved in the project were selected at random without regard to age, class standing or program of studies, although no vocational students participated in the study.

A careful review of related literature also proved to be invaluable in the development of this practicum. The writer was surprised to find in the Gaston College Learning Resources Center so many articles and books dealing with the subject of student involvement in college governance. Without the benefit of the related literature, this practicum would have been incomplete.

The rationale behind the procedures employed in the investigation was to determine student perception of their role in governance at Gaston College. No effort was made to determine appropriate areas of student involvement as concluded by administrators and faculty members. This would be another study in itself. This study covers only student

perception of their role in college affairs. The administration and faculty need to know what students think with regard to participation in governance. Knowledge of how students perceive their role in governance should enable Gaston College to plan for the future and more easily adjust to the rapid changes taking place in this area of education.

RESULTS

It should be emphasized that the results contained in this paper describe the opinions of Gaston College students only. It is entirely feasible that totally different results might be gotten from students at another educational institution using a similar or identical evaluative instrument. It is also conceivable that the results of this study would have been different had the writer selected a particular group of students, such as student government association members, rather than selecting students at random. Had this approach been taken, this practicum would have had a different title and perhaps some different outcomes. The writer preferred to determine what the ordinary Gaston College student - from the most involved to the least involved - thought about student involvement in institutional governance. There are merits to selecting students at large for such a study. Rather than discovering what members of a particular college group think, the sentiments of the typical student are revealed. We know what the vociferous students are thinking, but little is known about what the inconspicuous students are thinking. The results of this study disclose the opinions of the typical Gaston College student with regard to student involvement in governance.

In the practicum proposal the writer stated:

> It is expected that this study will show that students strongly desire to become more involved in governance at Gaston College and participate in college functions which have traditionally been reserved for administrators and faculty. The study will demonstrate that Gaston College students are not as apathetic about institutional affairs as many would have us believe.

The results of the investigation generally corroborate this expectation. The paramount conclusion of this report is that students want only to participate in and not control or dominate institutional policy formulation. Students want only an equal share in the decision-making process at Gaston College.

Of the thirty college activities students were asked to respond to regarding the desired degree of student participation, the study showed that students feel that there are seven areas in which there should be no student involvement, five areas in which there should be some student involvement, seventeen areas in which there should be equal student involvement, one area which students should largely control, and no areas which students should completely dominate. The following distribution of institutional activities resulted from the study.

Areas in Which Students Favored No Student Involvement

1. Selection of college president. Forty students favored no student involvement, thirty-four favored some student involvement and seventeen advocated equal student participation in selecting a president.

2. Faculty hiring. A substantial number of the students, sixty out of one-hundred, advocated no student involvement in hiring new faculty members.

3. Faculty promotion. Almost half of the students (forty-nine) were opposed to any student involvement in promoting faculty members. Thirty-two students, however, maintained that students should have some voice in faculty promotion.

4. Teaching loads. Forty-seven students were against student participation in determining teaching loads, thirty favored some student involvement and nineteen supported equal student participation.

5. Class size. Student responses to this college function were very close. Thirty-four students were against student participation, twenty-nine for some student participation and thirty-three favored equal student involvement with regard to determining class size.

6. Teacher salaries. There was no question concerning the feelings of students as to their role in determining teacher salaries. Seventy-four believed that students should not have any voice at all in establishing teacher salaries.

7. Requirements for degrees and certificates. Only thirty-four students advocated no student involvement with regard to participation in establishing requirements for degrees and certificates. Thirty students maintained that there should be some student participation and thirty-two favored equal involvement.

Areas in Which Students Favored Some Student Involvement

1. Setting institutional goals. Forty-nine students favored some student involvement in setting goals for Gaston College. Thirty-three students maintained that there should be equal involvement.

2. Establishing attendance policies. This issue was highly debatable among Gaston College students. Thirty-three of the students preferred some student involvement; thirty advocated equal student involvement; thirteen students maintained that attendance policies should be set by the students themselves.

3. Allocation of annual college budget. Forty-four percent of the students believed that they should have some voice in determining how the institution's budget is allocated.

4. Allocation of student financial aid. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents favored some student participation in determining how student financial aid is administered. Thirty-four percent preferred equal student involvement.

5. Determining administrative structure of the college. Thirty-seven students advocated some student participation in determining the administrative structure of Gaston College and twenty-six advocated equal student involvement.

Areas in Which Students Favored Equal Student Involvement

1. Selection of college officials directly related to student affairs. Of the students polled, thirty-four percent preferred equal student participation in the selection of student personnel workers and related personnel. Twenty-seven percent of the students preferred only some student participation in selecting these officials.

2. Allocation of student activity fees. Surprisingly, students at Gaston College opposed complete student control over the use of student activity fees. Instead, students recommended that decisions in this area be jointly decided by faculty and students.

3. Regulation of student conduct. Almost half of the students (47 percent) recommended equal student involvement in decisions concerning the regulation of student behavior.

4. Recognition of student organizations. Forty-four percent of the students maintained that the recognition of student organizations should be jointly determined, but twenty-seven percent preferred that this question be largely under student control.

5. Approval of guest speakers invited by students. Gaston College students narrowly decided that this should be a joint decision. Thirty-four percent decided for equal student involvement; thirty-two percent believed that this matter should be largely under student direction. Students definitely want stronger participation in this area.

6. Alterations in college calendar. Students were not that concerned about participation in changes in the college calendar. There were thirty-six students for equal participation but thirty-four students preferred only some student participation.

7. Distribution of student-initiated literature on campus. Students were not that decisive concerning this issue. Twenty-six preferred equal student involvement, twenty-five some student involvement, and twenty-four advocated that this matter should be largely under student control.

8. Distribution of off-campus literature on campus. Students did not want as much control over this issue as they did the distribution of student-initiated literature. Thirty-eight percent favored equal student control, twenty-one percent favored some student control and only fifteen percent believed that this should be largely under student control.

9. Release of student records. One could easily surmise that students would want to completely control policies dealing with the release of student records, but such is not the case at Gaston College. Twenty-seven percent advocated no student involvement, twenty-four percent recommended some student involvement and only twenty-nine percent preferred equal student participation.

10. Admissions standards for curricula and courses. One-third of Gaston College students desired equal participation in setting admissions standards for curricula and courses. Thirty students recommended some but not equal participation.

11. Curricula or course revision, addition or deletion. Forty-two students felt that students should be equally involved in any curricula or course revision, addition or deletion. The next largest group of students, twenty-nine, advocated only some student participation.

12. Student probation and suspension policies. Sixteen students believed that student probation and suspension policies should be largely under student control. Forty-two, however, maintained that both faculty and students should determine policy with regard to student probation and suspension.

13. Development of campus physical facilities. A goodly number of students, fifty-two percent, recommended equal student participation in the development of campus physical facilities. Thirty-three percent preferred only some student participation.

14. Planning annual commencement exercises. Gaston College students currently have little input in selecting a commencement speaker or planning other graduation exercises. Thirty-four students expressed the desire that

there should be at least some student input in commencement planning whereas forty students advocated equal student input.

15. College publications. Thirty-six percent of the students interviewed advocated joint participation by faculty and students in college publications. Others recommended even stronger student participation. Specifically, twenty-three percent recommended that college publications should be primarily under student direction and twenty-one percent favored complete control by students over college publications.

16. Establishing grading policies. Gaston College students desired equal involvement in establishing grading policies with thirty-seven percent advocating this approach. Twenty-six percent recommended only some student input and twenty-seven percent favored a total absence of student involvement.

17. Faculty evaluation. Clearly Gaston College students want a voice in faculty evaluation. Thirty-five students recommended equal involvement in evaluating the performance of faculty members. Twenty-five favored at least some student participation in faculty evaluation. Of the students consulted, eighteen preferred that faculty evaluation should be largely under student jurisdiction. Fifteen students favored complete control over faculty evaluation.

Of the thirty college functions analyzed by students with regard to desired student participation, there was only one activity students wanted to largely control - student publications. Forty percent of the students maintained that student publications should be almost totally in the hands of students. In addition, twenty-seven percent of the students insisted that student publications should be completely under student control.

As previously stated, students want to be involved in the decision-making processes at Gaston College. There is no desire among students to control or force their will upon the college administration and faculty. Since college policies greatly affect their daily lives, Gaston College students want only to participate in the formulation of these policies.

A recapitulation of the results of the study is recorded in the appendix.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the results of this investigation, the writer respectfully makes the following suggestions with regard to student participation in governance at Gaston College.

1. There should be a renewed commitment on the part of the administration at Gaston College to increase student participation in institutional governance. The importance of a definite commitment with regard to student involvement in institutional affairs cannot be overemphasized. When such a commitment exists, student apathy and resistance are minimal. This commitment to allow students to share in the decision-making process should be a salient point in the overall philosophy of Gaston College.[20] An atmosphere must be created in which students know that they may freely participate in the decision-making process.

2. Gaston College should explicitly define the students' role within the institution and the methods through which such a role can be properly put into effect. The absence of current procedures for relating student

---

[20] Richardson, "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms," op. cit., p. 34.

needs and concerns to the policy-formulating process within the institution produces confusion and a feeling of powerlessness among students. Students must have a structure through which their legitimate interests are identified and vigorously represented.

3. The control now exercised by the administration and faculty over matters should be halted. The best method of breaking this monopoly is by making students equal partners in building the curriculum and in making all the related decisions about the college's academic affairs - new courses, grading, college calendar, admissions, requirements and even decisions regarding faculty promotions.[21]

4. The time is ripe for the development of a joint council at Gaston College. The council would be composed of members from the administration, faculty, student body and nonprofessional staff. As is true with most colleges, the contenders for influence at Gaston College are these four groups, along with the board of trustees. Through the deliberations of a joint council, various points of view would be communicated, differences resolved and decisions made which would be in the best interest of the total college community. The joint council would consider all campus concerns, both academic and nonacademic. The council would not replace the organizations of the various constituent groups. Each constituency would select its own members to the joint council. The council would be a vehicle by which differences among groups could be communicated and by which an all-college point of view could be expressed The joint council would result in each constituent group having a voice

---

[21]Robert S. Powell, Jr., "Student Power and Educational Goals," Power and Authority, eds. Harold L. Hodgkinson and L. Richard Meeth (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1971), p. 72.

in decision-making at Gaston College and increase the espirit de corps of the institution. This is the major recommendation of this report.

5. A network of joint committees should be created at Gaston College to investigate and recommend to the joint council. Those committees which consider matters primarily related to student interests should have a majority of student members and a student chairman. The membership of such committees would be determined respective constituencies.

6. An effort should be made to greatly strengthen the student organization at Gaston College. Providing students with an effective organization is indispensable to a respect for their rights and freedoms. The student government association should be so organized as to occupy a position of power at least equivalent to the faculty organization.[22]

7. With regard to areas of involvement, students should have the right to help establish policy in those areas which affect them. This study has identified those areas in which students at Gaston College believe they should be involved. Student involvement in governance can only help to make Gaston College a better institution.

---

[22]Richardson, Blocker and Bender, op. cit., pp. 196-206.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Deegan, William L., Karl O. Drexel, John T. Collins and Dorothy L. Kearney. "Student Participation in Governance," The Junior College Journal, November, 1970.

Fitzgerald, Laurine E., Walter F. Johnson and Willa Norris. College Student Personnel. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.

Foote, Caleb, Henry Mayes and Associates. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1968.

Gaston College Gaslight, May, 1974.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. and L. Richard Meeth. Power and Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1971.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1972.

Richardson, Richard C., Clyde E. Blocker and Louis W. Bender. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

_____. "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms," The Junior College Journal, February, 1969.

_____. Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, eds. Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Smith, G. Kerry. Stress and Campus Response. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1968.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.

APPENDIX

A Summary of Student Perception of Their Role in Governance at Gaston College

	No Student Involvement	Some Student Involvement	Equal Student Involvement	Largely Student Controlled	Completely Student Controlled
1. Setting institutional goals	12	49	33	4	2
2. Establishing attendance policies	16	33	30	8	13
3. Student publications	4	7	22	40	27
4. Selection of college president	40	34	17	5	4
5. Selection of college officials directly related to student affairs	9	27	34	18	12
6. Allocation of student activity fees	4	17	43	24	12
7. Faculty hiring	60	28	10	2	0
8. Faculty promotion	49	32	14	4	1
9. Allocation of annual college budget	23	44	22	8	3
10. Regulation of student conduct	6	23	47	18	6
11. Recognition of student organization	4	12	44	27	13
12. Approval of guest speakers invited by students	4	17	34	32	13
13. Teaching loads	47	30	19	4	0
14. Class size	34	29	33	3	1
15. Alterations in college calendar	17	34	36	11	2
16. Distribution of student-initiated literature on campus	9	25	26	24	16
17. Distribution of off-campus literature on campus	16	21	38	15	10
18. Teacher salaries	74	20	5	1	0
19. Requirements for degrees and certificates	34	30	32	4	0
20. Release of student records	27	24	29	15	5

APPENDIX (continued)

	No Student Involvement	Some Student Involvement	Equal Student Involvement	Largely Student Controlled	Completely Student Controlled
21. Admissions standards for curricula and courses	29	30	34	7	0
22. Curricula or course revision, addition or deletion	16	29	42	11	2
23. Allocation of student financial aid	20	37	34	6	3
24. Student probation and suspension policies	13	25	42	16	4
25. Development of campus physical facilities	6	23	52	15	4
26. Determining administrative structure of the college	34	37	26	3	0
27. Planning commencement exercises	7	34	40	14	5
28. College publications	4	16	36	23	21
29. Establishing grading policies	27	26	37	7	3
30. Faculty evaluation	7	25	35	18	15

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
SEP 06 1974
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION